LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
APR 15 1972
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1971

No. 71-1328

JAMES AUBREY LANGHORNE, *Petitioner,*

v.

MAY LANGHORNE, ET AL., *Respondent.*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

THOMAS KEISTER GREER
110 Maple Avenue
Rocky Mount, Virginia

ALEXANDER N. APOSTOLOU
Shenandoah Building
Roanoke, Virginia

Counsel for Petitioner

WILLIAM N. ALEXANDER, II
DAVID ALEXANDER MELESCO
110 Maple Avenue
Rocky Mount, Virginia 24151

Of Counsel.

April 14, 1972

PRESS OF BYRON S. ADAMS PRINTING, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

INDEX

	Page
Opinion below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Question presented	2
Constitutional provision involved	2
Statement of the case	2
Reason for granting the writ	4
Conclusion	9
Appendix	1a

CITATIONS

CASES:

Hartford Steam Boiler Tire & Ins. Co. v. Harrison, 57 S. Ct. 838, 301 U. S. 459 (1937)	8
Hirabayashi v. United States, 320 U. S. 81, 100; 63 S. Ct. 1375, 1385 (1943)	7
Levy v. Louisiana, 88 S. Ct. 1509, 391 U. S. 68 (1968)	6, 7
Morey v. Dowd, 354 U. S. 457, 77 S. Ct. 1344 (1957)	5
Skinner v. Oklahoma, 316 U. S. 535, 541; 62 S. Ct. 1110, 1113 (1942)	8
Williamson v. Lee Optical Co., 348 U. S. 483, 75 S. Ct. 461 (1955)	5
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U. S. 356, 6 S. Ct. 1064 (1886)	5

STATUTES:

CODE OF VIRGINIA tit. 63, §§ 63.1-233–63.1-234 (1950)	6
Constitution of the United States, Amendment XIV, Section 1	2, 4, 5
28 U.S.C. Section 1257(3)	2

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1971

No.

JAMES AUBREY LANGHORNE, *Petitioner,*

v.

MAY LANGHORNE, ET AL., *Respondent.*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

The petitioner, James Aubrey Langhorne, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the Supreme Court of Virginia entered in this proceeding on January 17, 1972.[1]

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Virginia is reported in 212 Va., at page 577, and appears in the appendix hereto.

---

[1] The respondents are May Langhorne and Rieta Langhorne DuManoir, the surviving substituted trustees under the will of D. Allan Langhorne, and Allen F. Langhorne and Beverley Langhorne Kirill the natural children of W. Devereux Langhorne.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Virginia was entered on January 17, 1972. This petition for certiorari was filed within 90 days of that date. This Court's jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. Section 1257 (3).

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether a state court ruling that an adopted child cannot take as "issue" of an adoptive grandparent denies the adoptive child equal protection of the laws.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendment XIV, Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In 1912, D. Allan Langhorne executed his last will and testament, and in 1914 he executed a codicil to this will. Testator died in 1917 and these documents were offered and admitted to probate on October 22, 1917, as D. Allan Langhorne's last will and testament and codicil.

Testator left serviving him his widow, Effie B. Langhorne, and five children—two daughters, May Langhorne and Rieta L. DuManoir, and three sons. One

son, D. Allan Langhorne, Jr., died in 1934, unmarried and without any children surviving. A second son, C. D. Langhorne, died in 1964 and was survived by one son. The third son, W. Devereux Langhorne, died in 1969, survived by his widow, Christine Thomas Langhorne, two children by a former marriage, Allen F. Langhorne and Beverley L. Kirill, and by James Aubrey Langhorne, the petitioner herein who is a child of Christine and who was adopted by him on November 22, 1960.

In his will D. Allan Langhorne created a testamentary trust for the benefit of his widow and children during their lives and directed that after his wife's death that:

> ". . . whenever anyone of my children shall die, leaving issue surviving him, or her, and the youngest of such issue shall attain the age of 21 years, then the share or shares of my said estate upon which his, her, or their, parents' income was derived shall pass absolutely and in fee simple to such issue. . . ."

The testator's widow died in 1935. His son, W. Devereux Langhorne, who died in 1969, left surviving him two natural children, Allen F. Langhorne and Beverly L. Kirill, and an adopted child James Aubrey Langhorne. All three children are over the age of twenty-one. May Langhorne and Rieta Langhorne DuManoir, two of the respondents herein and the surviving substituted trustees under the testator's will, filed a Bill of Guidance in the Corporation Court of the City of Lynchburg naming the children of W. Devereux Langhorne as respondents and seeking the guidance and protection of the Court for making a distribution of W. Devereux Langhorne's share of the trust estate.

The trial court held that W. Devereux Langhorne's share of the trust estate should be distributed to Allen F. Langhorne and Beverly L. Kirill and that James Aubrey Langhorne, the adopted child, should be excluded from sharing in the distribution. In the adopted child's Memorandum of Authorities filed in the trial court on behalf of James Aubrey Langhorne it was asserted that an adopted child had the right and privilege to take as "issue" under a will and that to deprive him of this right was to deny him rights and privileges guaranteed to him by the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

In the notice of appeal and assignments of error filed in the Corporation Court it was asserted that that Court had erred in excluding James Aubrey Langhorne from testator's will, in that such a denial deprived him of rights guaranteed him by the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. Further, this federal right was again specifically claimed in the petition for appeal and briefs submitted to the Supreme Court of Virginia in behalf of the petitioner.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The Supreme Court of Virginia's decision arbitrarily discriminates between natural and adopted children and denies the adoptive child the equal protection of the laws.

Quite clearly adopted children are "persons" and therefore come within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment. The question now is whether the adopted child, James Aubrey Langhorne, has been denied "the equal protection of the laws" by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

It is the petitioner's contention that the Supreme Court of Virginia has, by defining "issue" to exclude

adopted children, denied him "the equal protection of the laws" guaranteed him by the Fourteenth Amendment. The Virginia Court in its opinion plainly stated that Testator's will ". . . gives no indication of whether or not the Testator wished to include descendants through adoption. . . ." Yet the Court stated the rule to be that:

> "A Testator does not intend by the word 'issue' . . . to include persons who qualify as such only by or through adoption. . . ."

In other words, the Virginia Court has defined the word "issue" to mean only natural issue or issue of the body. Such a definition discriminates against adopted children.

Of course, all discrimination does not violate the mandate of the 14th Amendment. Ordinarily the inquiry under the 14th Amendment is whether there is some reasonable basis for discrimination by the state action and whether the lines drawn are rational ones or whether the discrimination is invidious. See *Morey* v. *Doud*, 354 U.S. 457, 77 S. Ct. 1344 (1957); *Williamson* v. *Lee Optical Co.*, 348 U.S. 483, 75 S. Ct. 461 (1955); *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 6 S. Ct. 1064 (1886). No reasonable basis for the discrimination between adopted children and natural children appears from the Virginia Court's opinion. In fact, no reason is given by the Court indicating why the neutral word "issue" includes natural children but excludes those adopted.

To discriminate between adopted children and natural children within the same familial unit is to draw an irrational, unreasonable and unnatural line. For the Virginia Court to make such a distinction based solely

on the word "issue" amounts to invidious discrimination in that it places children of the same family in separate classes for no valid reason. The Court has advanced no compelling state interest justifying the denial of an adopted child his fundamental right to be treated equally with a natural child.

The language of Virginia's adoption statutes in no way supports the Court's decision. In fact, Section 63.1-233 of the Code of Virginia which provides:

> ". . . Any child adopted under the provisions of this chapter shall, from and after the entry of the interlocutory order or from and after the entry of the final order . . . be, to all intents and purposes, the child of the person or persons so adopting him. . . ."

and Section 63.1-234 which provides that:

> "For the purpose of descent and distribution, a legally adopted child shall inherit, according to the statutes of descent and distribution, from and through the parents by adoption from the time of entry of an interlocutory order or the final order if there is no interlocutory order and shall not inherit from the natural parents. . . ."

strongly command that adopted children and natural children are to be treated equally.

This Court in the recent case of *Levy* v. *Louisiana*, 391 U.S. 68, 71; 88 S.Ct. 1509, 1511 (1968), held that to deny illegitimate children the right to recover for the wrongful death of their mother constituted invidious discrimination against them. In so holding the Court stated:

> "Why should the illegitimate child be denied rights merely because of his birth out of wedlock?

> He certainly is subject to all the responsibilities of a citizen, including the payment of taxes and conscription under the Selective Service Act. How under our regime can he be denied correlative rights which other citizens enjoy?"

Levy v. *Louisiana, supra,* is very similar to the case at bar and the reasoning there applies equally to petitioner's situation. Why should an adopted child be denied the right of inheritance as "issue" merely because he is not the natural child of the adoptive parents? He is equal to the natural child for all other intents and purposes.

The rights asserted in *Levy, supra,* involved the intimate, familial relationship between a child and his own mother. The rights asserted here by the petitioner involve the same intimate, familial relationship between an adopted child and his natural brothers and sisters. The adopted child is in no way responsible for his birth and should not be discriminated against merely because he is not a natural born child. It would be a gross injustice to legally disadvantage a child on the basis of factors over which he had absolutely no control.

In *Hirabayashi* v. *United States,* 320 U.S. 81, 100; 63 S. Ct. 1375, 1385 (1943), this Court stated that:

> "Distinctions between citizens solely because of their ancestry are by their very nature odious to a free people whose institutions are founded upon the doctrine of equality."

To legally distinguish between adopted children and natural children living in the same household with the same parents solely on the basis of their birth would go far in disrupting the most basic, necessary and socially desirable unit of our society—the family.

The primary mandate of the equal protection clause is that all persons shall be treated alike under like circumstances and conditions, both in privileges conferred and in the liabilities imposed. See *Hartford Steam Boiler Tire & Ins. Co.* v. *Harrison,* 301 U.S. 459; 57 S. Ct. 838 (1937). Children of the same family unit and household should be treated alike whether they are adopted or natural. All adopted children are entitled to the same equal protection of the laws as their natural brother and sisters. When the right of inheritance is denied them by an arbitrary definition of the word "issue", the basic notion of equality is destroyed.

In *Skinner* v. *Oklahoma,* 62 S. Ct. 1110, 1113; 316 U.S. 535, 541 (1942), this Court said that:

> ". . . When the law lays an unequal hand on those who have committed intrinsically the same quality of offense and sterilizes one and not the other, it has made as an invidious a discrimination as if it had selected a particular race or nationality for oppressive treatment."

In the instant case the Supreme Court of Virginia has laid the unequal hand of the law on the adopted child, James Aubrey Langhorne, and decreed that he is not to be treated equally with his natural brother and sister; that he is to be deprived of his rightful inheritance because of an arbitrary definition of the word "issue"; and that in the eyes of the law he is really not a child for all intents and purposes but a child whose status lies somewhat below that of a natural child.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons a writ of certiorari should issue to review the judgment and opinion of the Supreme Court of Virginia.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS KEISTER GREER
110 Maple Avenue
Rocky Mount, Virginia

ALEXANDER N. APOSTOLOU
Shenandoah Building
Roanoke, Virginia

Counsel for Petitioner

WILLIAM N. ALEXANDER, II
DAVID ALEXANDER MELESCO
110 Maple Avenue
Rocky Mount, Virginia 24151

Of Counsel.

April 14, 1972

APPENDIX

Opinion

212 Va. 577

RICHMOND

JAMES AUBREY LANGHORNE

v.

MAY LANGHORNE, ET AL.

January 17, 1972.

Record No. 7725.

Present, All the Justices.

Wills—"Issue"—Adopted Child.

Testator by use of word "issue" does not intend to include adopted persons unless the intention to include those persons is expressed or reasonably implied by language of will or may be reasonably inferred from extrinsic evidence properly before court.

Appeal from a decree of the Corporation Court of the City of Lynchburg. Hon. O. Raymond Cundiff, judge presiding.

Affirmed.

Alex N. Apostolou; William Nelson Alexander, II (*Thomas Keister Greer*, on brief), for appellant.

Edward S. Graves (*Edmunds, Williams, Robertson, Sackett, Baldwin & Graves*, on brief), for appellees.

GORDON, J., delivered the opinion of the court.

We must again decide whether the term "issue", as used in a will, includes not only descendants of the body, but also descendants through adoption.

The testator, D. Allan Langhorne, died in 1917. He created a testamentary trust for the benefit of his widow and children during their lives, directing that after his wife's death:

> "whenever any one of my said children shall die, leaving issue surviving him, or her, and the youngest of such issue shall attain the age of twenty-one years, then the share, or shares, of my said estate upon which his, her, or their, parent's income was derived shall pass absolutely and in fee simple to such issue . . ."

The testator's widow died in 1935, and his son W. Devereux Langhorne died in 1964. W. Devereux Langhorne was survived by two natural children, Allen F. Langhorne and Beverley Langhorne Kirill, and an adopted child, James Aubrey Langhorne. All three children are over twenty-one.

The trial court held that a share of the trust estate should be distributed to Allen F. Langhorne and Beverley L. Kirill, to the exclusion of James Aubrey Langhorne, the adopted child. James Aubrey Langhorne appeals.*

The question of course is what persons the testator intended to benefit under his will, not what persons would inherit if he had died intestate. Unfortunately, as is often the case, the language of the will gives no indication whether or not the testator wished to include descendants through adoption, as well as descendants of the body. The odds are that neither the testator nor his draftsman considered the question.

Much can be said for or against the inclusion of adopted children where a will or deed is silent in that regard. But

---

* The appellees are May Langhorne and Rieta Langhorne DuManoir, Surviving Substituted Trustees under the will of D. Allan Langhorne, and Allen F. Langhorne and Beverley Langhorne Kirill.

the Virginia cases have already charted our course of decision. *See Merson* v. *Wood*, 202 Va. 485, 117 S.E.2d 661 (1961); *Newsome* v. *Scott*, 200 Va. 833, 108 S.E.2d 369 (1959); *Fletcher* v. *Flanary*, 185 Va. 409, 38 S.E.2d 433 (1946); and the cases cited therein. The rule to be gleaned from those cases is: A testator does not intend by the word "issue" or "descendants" to include persons who qualify as such only by or through adoption, unless the intent to include those persons is expressed or reasonably implied by the language of the will or may be reasonably inferred from extrinsic evidence properly before the court.

Following the rule set out in the preceding paragraph, we hold that the trial court properly excluded James Aubrey Langhorne from a share of the estate.

Affirmed.

FILED
APR 28 1972

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1971

No. 71-1328

James Aubrey Langhorne, Petitioner,

v.

May Langhorne, et al., Respondent.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

EDMUNDS, WILLIAMS, ROBERTSON,
SACKETT, BALDWIN & GRAVES
916 Main Street
Lynchburg, Virginia 24505

Counsel for Respondents
Allen F. Langhorne and
Beverly Langhorne Kirill

By: Edward S. Graves
Of Counsel

April 27, 1972

INDEX

	Page
Question Presented	1
Failure to Include Judgment, Etc.	2
Statement of the Case	2
Argument	3
Conclusion	9

CITATIONS

Amoskeag Trust Co. v. Preston, 197 N.H. 330, 222 A.2d 158 (1966)	7
Burruss v. Baldwin, 199 Va. 883, 103 S.E. 2d 249 (1958)	4
Carroll v. Snead, 211 Va. 640, 179 S.E. 2d 620 (1971)	3
Dickenson v. Buck, 169 Va. 39, 192 S.E. 748 (1937)	6
In Re Estate of Comly, 90 N.J. Super. 498, 218 A.2d 175 (1966)	8
Fiduciary Trust Co. v. Sillsbee, 159 Me. 6, 187 A.2d 396 (1963)	6

Page

Fletcher v. Flanary, 185 Va. 409, 38 S.E. 2d 433 (1946) 6

Glona v. American Etc. Co., 391 U.S. 73, 20 L Ed 2d 441, 88 S.Ct. 1515 (1968) 3

In Re Hulbert's Estate, 17 A.D. 2d 964, 233 N.Y.S. 2d 814 (1962) 8

Labine v. Vincent, 401 U.S. 532, 28 L Ed 288, 91 S.Ct. 1017 (1971) 3,8

Levy v. Louisiana, 391 U.S. 68, L Ed 2d 435, 88 S.Ct. 1509 (1968) 3

Lyeth v. Hoey, 305 U.S. 188, 83 L Ed 119 (1938) 8

Mager v. Grima, 8 How. 490, 12 L Ed 1168 (1950) 8

McFadden v. McNorton, 193 Va. 455, 69 S.E. 2d 445 (1952) 6

Merson v. Wood, 202 Va. 485, 117 S.E. 2d 661 (1961) 6

Mott v. National Bank of Commerce, 190 Va. 1006, 59 S.E. 2d 97 (1950) 6

Page

Munday v. Munday's Ex-rs, 164 Va. 145, 178 S.E. 917 (1935) 6

*Newson v. Scott, 200 Va. 833, 108 S.E. 2d 369 (1959) 6
*Erratum: Newsome

Security National Bank & Trust Co. v. Willim, 151 W.Va. 429, 153 S.E. 2d 114 (1967) 6

Turner v. Monteiro, 127 Va. 537, 103 S.E. 572 (1920) 6

Wilson v. Johnson, (Ky., 1965), 389 S.W. 2d 634 7

Wohlford v. Wohlford, 121 Va. 699, 93 S.E. 629 (1917) 4

STATUTES

Code of Virginia, Secs. 64.1-13, 64.1-16, 64.1-19 4

Code of Virginia, Secs. 64.1-49 4

Constitution of United States, 14th Amendment 1,8,9

SECONDARY AUTHORITIES

Anno., 86 ALR 2d 12 6

Page

1 Bowe-Parker: Page on Wills, Secs. 2.18, 3.1, 3.11 4

Graves on Real Property, (1912 ed.), Sec. 222 (p. 266) 5

Halbach, Rights of Adopted Children, 50 Iowa Law Rev. 971, pp. 988-9, 990, 994 8

1 Harrison on Wills & Administration (1927) Sec. 201, p. 415 5

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1971

No.

James Aubrey Langhorne, Petitioner,

v.

May Langhorne, et al., Respondent.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

The respondents, Allen F. Langhorne and Beverly Langhorne Kirill, file this brief in opposition to said Petition.

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether D. Allen Langhorne, the Testator, was compelled by the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, contrary to his expressed intent, to include as a beneficiary under his will a person adopted at the age of 16 years by one of the Testator's sons 43 years after the Testator's death.

FAILURE TO INCLUDE JUDGMENT OR DECREE OF STATE COURT

While the Petition includes the opinion of the Supreme Court of Virginia in the instant case, the judgment or decree of the State Court is not included pursuant to Rule 23, 1.(j).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Statement of the Case by Petitioner is substantially correct. Several portions of the Testator's will are omitted, which additionally confine to his children's "issue" the benefits thereunder; a copy of the entire Article Second of the will is included in the Appendix of this Brief. The Petitioner also failed to include in his Statement that he was adopted at the age of 16 years by W. Devereux Langhorne, a son of the Testator, in 1960, 43 years after the death of the Testator and after W. Devereux Langhorne had been advised, according to the allegations of the Petitioner, that a person adopted by him would share in the Testator's estate. A copy of the adoption decree is included in the Appendix.

It is noted, purely for the purposes of the record, that the

Testator's will was executed in 1914 rather than in 1912.

ARGUMENT

1. The law of Virginia does not discriminate against adopted persons.

Contrary to certain laws of Louisiana, considered in the cases of Levy v. Louisiana, 391 U.S. 68, 20 L Ed 2d 436, 88 S.Ct. 1509 (1968), Glona v. American Etc. Co., 391 U.S. 73, 20 L Ed 2d 441, 88 S.Ct. 1515 (1968), and Labine v. Vincent, 401 U.S. 532, 28 L Ed 288, 91 S.Ct. 1017 (1971), the laws of Virginia do not discriminate against adopted persons who, as indicated by the statutes cited on p. 6 of the Petition, are made to all intents the children of the adoptive parents, and inherit through as well as from them.

(The particular question involved in the Levy case had already been considered and determined in Virginia prior to that decision; and an illegitimate child had been held entitled to benefits under our Wrongful Death Statute. See Carroll v. Snead, 211 Va. 640, 179 S.E. 2d 620 (1971), confirming an earlier holding.)

Since the instant case involves

the interpretation of a will rather than the statutory devolution of property, it should be noted that Chapter 3 of Title of 64.1 of the Code of Virginia, containing Virginia's Statute of Wills (see especially Sec. 64.1-49) contains no restrictions against the inclusion of adopted persons as beneficiaries under a will; and consequently, since there is no discrimination at all, there is no occasion to determine whether our laws meet the more restrictive test of being invidiously discriminatory.

In Virginia, as elsewhere, a testator is free, subject to over-riding restrictive doctrines such as the rule against perpetuities and to the rights of a spouse to take against a will, to leave his property as seems proper to him.

1 Bowe-Parker: Page on Wills, Secs. 2.18, 3.1, 3.11

Wohlford v. Wohlford, 121 Va. 699, 93 S.E. 629 (1917)

Burruss v. Baldwin, 199 Va. 883, 103 S.E. 2d 249 (1958)

Code of Virginia, Secs. 64.1-13, 64.1-16, 64.1-19

A testator may consequently leave his

property to one or more of his children, to some relatives and not others, to some friends and not others, to some charities and not others, pursuant to his own knowledgeable choice. Subject to the restrictive laws mentioned, there is no Virginia law, either statutory or court developed, which requires him to discriminate for or against adopted persons.

2. The Testator did not invidiously discriminate against the Petitioner.

The question in the instant case was not, as might be implied from its phrasing on page 2 of the Petition, whether the Testator was prevented from benefiting a 16-year old child adopted 43 years after his death by one of his sons; it was, rather, whether the will of the Testator, interpreted as of the time it was written and spoke, contained any provision for such an adopted child.

The applicable Virginia authorities have consistently construed the word "issue", in documents effective both before and after 1914 and 1917, to exclude adopted persons.

Graves on Real Property (1912 ed.), sec. 222 (p. 266)

1 Harrison on Wills & Administration (1927), sec. 201, p. 415

Turner v. Monteiro, 127 Va. 537, 103 S.E. 572 (1920)

Munday v. Munday's Ex-rs, 164 Va. 145, 178 S.E. 917 (1935)

Dickenson v. Buck, 169 Va. 39, 192 S.E. 748 (1937)

Fletcher v. Flanary, 185 Va. 409, 38 S.E. 2d 433 (1946)

Mott v. National Bank of Commerce, 190 Va. 1006, 59 S.E. 2d 97 (1950)

McFadden v. McNorton, 193 Va. 455, 69 S.E. 2d 445 (1952)

Newson v. Scott, 200 Va. 833, 108 S.E. 2d 369 (1959)

Merson v. Wood, 202 Va. 485, 117 S.E. 2d 661 (1961)

These authorities are in line with the majority of jurisdictions.

Anno., 86 ALR 2d 12

Security National Bank & Trust Co. v. Willim, 151 W.Va. 429, 153 S.E. 2d 114 (1967)

Fiduciary Trust Co. v. Sillsbee, 159 Me. 6, 187 A.2d 396 (1963)

Amoskeag Trust Co. v. Preston,
107 N.H. 330, 222 A.2d 158
(1966)

The word "issue" is a narrow word; it is not neutral (as characterized on page 5 of the Petition), but graphic, implying that the child came forth from the parents' bodies; it is even narrower than "descendent", which may include not only issue but those entitled to inherit under a statute of descents and distributions.

In the instant case, the Testator not only used the word "issue" in a jurisdiction which had construed the word to include only those born of the body; the Testator was a stranger to the adoption; the Petitioner was adopted 43 years after the Testator's death by a son who had children of his body; the adopted person was 16 years old at the time of the adoption; and the adoptive parent had been advised before the adoption that the Petitioner would be made a beneficiary under the will. Even minority authorities, including commentators frankly favoring adopted children, would deny that the Testator, under such circumstances, intended the adopted person as a beneficiary.

Wilson v. Johnson, ___ Ky. ___,
389 S.W. 2d 634 (1965)

In Re Estate of Comly, 90 N.J. Super. 498, 218 A.2d 175 (1966)

In Re Hulbert's Estate, 17 A.D. 2d 964, 233 N.Y.S. 2d 814 (1962)

See Halbach, Rights of Adopted Children, 50 Iowa Law Rev. 971, pp. 988-9, 990, 994

Even if this Court would properly be asked to construe the Testator's will and assume the applicability of the 14th Amendment, the conclusion could doubtless be reached that the Testator's classification of the objects of his bounty was without invidious discrimination.

3. Review of wills to determine whether a Testator's selection of beneficiaries was invidiously discriminatory is not required by the 14th Amendment of the U. S. Constitution.

In Labine v. Vincent, supra, the opinion of the majority cited with approval Mager v. Grima, 8 How. 490, 12 L Ed 1168 (1850), and Lyeth v. Hoey, 305 U.S. 188, 83 L Ed 119 (1938), in which latter case the Court said (305 U.S. at p. 193 and 83 L Ed at p. 123):

> "The local law determines the right to make a testamentary disposition of such property and the conditions essential

to the validity of wills, and the State Courts settle their construction."

To repudiate this policy and undertake to review the propriety of testamentary dispositions under the "invidious discrimination" test would not only be inappropriate, but would thrust a heavy work load upon the Courts, as this Petition illustrates.

CONCLUSION

The law of Virginia does not discriminate against adopted persons and did not in this case cause any discrimination against the Petitioner. For a Testator to exclude persons from his testamentary bounty is not invidious discrimination under the 14th Amendment; but even if this Court were to establish the doctrine that wills must be reviewed to determine whether improper discrimination is present under the Amendment, there would be no such discrimination in this Testator's intentionally confining his bounty to natural born grandchildren and in excluding a person adopted at the age of 16 years some 43 years after the Testator's death by one of his children with the purpose of affecting the devolution of the Testator's property contrary to his intentions.

It is therefore urged that the Petitioner for Certiorari be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

EDMUNDS, WILLIAMS, ROBERTSON,
SACKETT, BALDWIN & GRAVES
916 Main Street
Lynchburg, Virginia 24505

Counsel for Respondents
Allen F. Langhorne and
Beverly Langhorne Kirill

By: Edward S. Graves
Edward S. Graves

April 27, 1972

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

Three copies of the foregoing brief in opposition were deposited in the U. S. Post Office, with first class postage prepaid, addressed to counsel of record at their respective post office addresses, on April 27, 1972.

Edward S. Graves
Of Counsel

A P P E N D I X

SECOND: I devise and bequeath unto my beloved wife, Effie B. Langhorne, as Executrix and Trustee, and her successors, as hereinafter named and provided for, my entire estate, real, personal and mixed, whatsoever and wheresoever situate, upon the following trusts, limitations and conditions, nevertheless, and no other, that is to say:- to pay out of the net annual income thereof, at such periods as my said Executrix and Trustee shall designate, after deducting all taxes and other necessary charges and expenses for the care and protection of my estate, Ten Thousand ($10,000) Dollars a year to my beloved wife, Effie B. Langhorne, for and during the term of her natural life, and the rest and residue of the net income of my said estate to my children, in such shares, or portions, during the term of their natural lives, as my said Executrix and Trustee shall, in her absolute discretion, deem wise and expedient; and upon the death of any one of my said children to pay such share or portion of the income of my said estate to his, or her, issue then living, as my said Executrix and Trustee shall, in her absolute discretion, deem fit and proper; if no such issue be living, for the use and benefit of the survivor, or survivors of my said children, and to the issue of such of my children as may be dead, per stirpes. Upon the death, or

resignation, of my said wife, to my oldest son then living, Legh R. Page, Esq., of Richmond, Virginia, and the Old Dominion Trust Company, Inc., a corporation having its principal place of business at Richmond, Virginia, as her successor or successors, upon the following trusts, limitations and conditions, nevertheless, and no other, that is to say:- to pay the net annual income thereof, at such periods as my said Executors and Trustees shall designate, after deducting the taxes and all other necessary charges and expenses for the care and protection of my estate, to my said children then living, or the issue of any of my said children who may be dead, in such share, or portions, as my said wife, Effie B. Langhorne, Executrix and Trustee as hereinbefore provided, may have, by deed or will, prescribed, but in the event that my said Executrix and Trustee shall have made no such provision by will or deed, in equal shares during the terms of the natural lives of my said children, respectively; and upon the death of any one of my said children, his, or her, share of the income of my estate to his, or her, issue then living; and if no such issue be then living, for the use and benefit of the survivor, or survivors, of my said children and to the issue of those of my said children who may be dead, for life, per stirpes, and upon the death of any

of my said children, leaving issue, and the youngest of said issue attaining the age of twenty-one years, to pay over absolutely and in fee simple, per stirpes, such share, or portion, of the corpus of my estate as that from which the said issue had prior to the youngest attaining the age of twenty-one years received the income; it being my intention that my said children shall enjoy the income of my estate equally during the terms of their natural lives, respectively, in the event my said wife shall not have made a different division of the said income of my estate as hereinabove provided; if any of my said children shall die, leaving issue, the said issue shall take equally the income which his, her, or their parent would have received had such parent been living; and if any one of my said children shall die without issue, or leaving issue, and such issue shall die before attaining the age of twenty-one years, then the income of the share, or shares, that he, she, or they, would have received shall pass by survivorship for life to the other of my said children, and to the issue of any of my said children who shall then be dead; and, lastly, that whenever any one of my said children shall die, leaving issue surviving him, or her, and the youngest of such issue shall attain the age of twenty-one years, then the share, or shares, of my said estate upon which

his, her, or their, parent's income was derived shall pass absolutely and in fee simple to such issue, so that the issue of any of my said children so dying shall take between them, share and share alike, absolutely and in fee simple, the share in which his, her, or their, parent was entitled to a life interest.

VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY

IN RE: ADOPTION OF JAMES AUBREY FENNELL, and Change of his Name to JAMES AUBREY LANGHORNE

DECREE

This day came William Devereux Langhorne and Christine Thomas Langhorne, by their counsel, praying leave to file their petition, which leave was accordingly granted, and said petition filed.

And it appearing to the Court from said petition, which is duly executed as required by law, that William Devereux Langhorne and Christine Thomas Langhorne are residents of the County of Northumberland, Virginia; that on the _____ day of January, 1944, Christine Thomas Langhorne, who was then Christine Virginia Thomas, was married to Benjamin Edward Fennell in Elkton, Maryland; that there was born of this marriage one son, James Aubrey Fennell, who was born at Brooklyn, Maryland, on the 12th day of September, 1944; that on the 27th day of January, 1950, Christine Thomas Langhorne, then Christine Thomas

Fennell, was granted an absolute divorce from Benjamin Edward Fennell by a decree of the Circuit Court of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, and that she was awarded the exclusive custody and control of said child; that the petitioners were lawfully married on the 4th day of August, 1953; that said William Devereux Langhorne desires to adopt the said child and to have his name changed from James Aubrey Fennell to James Aubrey Langhorne; that said Christine Thomas Langhorne consents thereto as evidenced by her joining in said petition indicating her consent thereto; that the said child, James Aubrey Fennell, consents to the prayer of said petition as evidenced by his written consent duly executed and filed with said petition;

The Court doth ADJUDGE, ORDER and DECREE that the name of James Aubrey Fennell be and the same is hereby changed to James Aubrey Langhorne, and, under the provisions of § 63-351(1), Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, the Court dispenses with the requirement of the consent of the natural father of said infant, and doth ADJUDGE, ORDER and DECREE that said child shall be to all intents and purposes the child and heir of William Devereux Langhorne, as well as Christine Thomas Langhorne, his mother by birth, and that said infant shall be entitled to all rights and

privileges and subject to all of the obligations of a child born in lawful wedlock to the said petitioners; and, the Court being of opinion that this order is proper and should be made pursuant to §§ 63-356.1, and 63-356.2, Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, without reference to the Director of Welfare and Institutions, and without probationary period, the said child being over the age of 16 years, having lived continuously with the petitioners more than five years, and having consented, such reference and probationary period are hereby dispensed with. The Clerk shall make report of this proceeding as provided of § 63-359, Code of Virginia, 1950.